

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

REMARKS

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102*

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gehman et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,553, hereinafter "Gehman").

As to claim 1, the Examiner states:

"As to claim 1, Gehman teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gehman is for processing inside a personal computer and this is shown in Gehman FIGs. 2 and 3 which show the client 200 (a personal computer) and the serial bus adapter 219/300 (inside the personal computer), which contains the transmit and receive FIFOs 310 and 312. This is explained in Gehman col. 2, line 56, through col. 3, line 54:

"With reference now to FIG. 2, a block diagram of a data processing system in which the present invention may be implemented is illustrated. Data processing system 200 is an example of a client computer. ...

An operating system runs on processor 202 and is used to coordinate and provide control of various components within data processing system 200 in FIG. 2. The operating system may be a commercially available operating system such as NT Windows or OS/2. ...

Turning now to FIG. 3, Serial bus adapter 300...includes a number of components used to provide an interface between PCI local bus 302 and a 1394 serial bus 304. Serial bus adapter in the depicted example may be serial bus adapter 219 from FIG. 2. Serial bus adapter 300 includes a physical layer device 306, a link 308, a transmit FIFO unit 310, a receive FIFO unit 312, a DMA engine 314, and a host interface 316." [underlining and deletions for clarity]

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination, as exemplified in claim 1, includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"A network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:  
a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 1, Gehman teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:  
a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25);" [underlining for clarity]

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As explained in Gehman col. 2, line 56, through col. 3, line 54, cited above, Gehman teaches how signals are processed within a client device not how signals from a client device to a server are processed. It is respectfully submitted that the nature of the messages in Gehman are different; e.g., PCI local bus to 1394 signals versus serial to parallel Hypertext Transfer Protocol messages.

The Examiner continues:

"[As to claim 1, Gehman teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:]

...  
a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the server (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)." [insertion and deletion for clarity]

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gehman does not describe a "regular-expression pattern matching circuit" or recognizing "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers" in Gehman col. 1, lines 13-24, which states:

"...The packet includes a header and a payload. The header includes information identifying the target, payload type, source, and various control data as specified by the protocol while the payload holds the data that is transmitted. When a packet is received at a data processing system, the packet is parsed to see if the packet is intended for the data processing system."

Gehman also does not describe a "regular-expression pattern matching circuit" or recognizing "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers" in Gehman col. 1, lines 39-47, which states:

"Currently, on a data processing system using the 1394 standard, a link, providing the interface to the 1394 serial bus, must parse a received packet to determine whether to accept the packet and whether to acknowledge acceptance of a packet. If the packet is accepted, the link places the packet into

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

a buffer configured as a first-in-first-out (FIFO) buffer. On the other side of the FIFO buffer in the data processing system is a DMA engine that removes the packet and parses the packet in a manner similar to the link."

Gehman also teaches away from the above by indicating the problems with the above and that an improved system is desirable by referring to the above and stating in the last paragraph of Gehman at col. 1, lines 48-51:

"This mechanism results in redundant functions and circuitry. Therefore, it would be advantageous to have an improved method and apparatus for receiving packets on a data processing system."

Further, with regard to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Gehman does not disclose a combination that includes the claimed limitation of:

"...the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the server."

As seen in Gehman col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47, cited by the Examiner and quoted above, there is no mention of the concurrent operations claimed. This has the advantages described in Specification page 7, line 30, through page 8, line 4:

"The present invention allows regular-expression pattern matching to be performed concurrently with the serial-to-parallel message-component assembly, such that message protocol header analysis can be done while incoming data is being clocked into the FIFO buffer 104. In this way, the message protocol header analysis incurs no extra time delay, and a compact representation of the extracted message protocol header information is ready for transfer to the web server 26 at the same time as the ordinary, assembled parts of the message. This technique may be referred to as "latency hiding"; i.e., overlapping some parts of a series of information processing steps in order to reduce the sequence's overall delay."

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" [emphasis added] Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co. (730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)(citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)))

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 2, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 2, Gehman teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 further including: a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2) since no logic circuit having the claimed functions is described in Gehman col. 1, lines 55-63, which states:

"The present invention provides a method and apparatus for receiving packets from a bus. A packet is received at an interface to the bus. The packet is parsed, and a determination is made whether to retain the packet from the parsing of the packet. The packet is placed in a buffer with a header. The packet is moved from the buffer to another bus using information located within the header, wherein repeated parsing of the packet to move the packet to another bus is unnecessary."

Similarly, Gehman col. 2, lines 43-55, states:

"In the depicted example, a server 104 is connected to network 102 along with storage unit 106. In addition, clients 108, 110, and 112 also are connected to a network 102. These clients 108, 110, and 112 maybe, for example, personal computers or network computers. For purposes of this application, a network computer is any computer, coupled to a network, which receives a program or other application from another computer coupled to the network. In the depicted example, server 104 provides data, such as boot files, operating system images, and applications to clients 108-112. Clients 108, 110, and 112 are clients to server 104. Distributed data processing system 100 may include additional servers, clients, and other devices not shown."

Similarly, Gehman col. 3, lines 12-15, states:

"The LAN may be implemented as a serial bus architecture in the depicted example. In such a case, the processes of the present invention may be implemented in LAN adapter 210."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 3, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 3, Gehman teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 4, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 4, Gehman teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 5, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 5, Gehman teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col. 1, lines 39-48)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 6, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

"As to claim 6, Gehman teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 7, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman of

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies, and  
the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof and  
a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message header."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 7, Gehman teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:

a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25);

a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the server, and provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24),  
and

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col.1, lines 39-48); and

a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message header (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15). 11.””

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no HTTP cookies, regular-expression matching circuit, or claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 8, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed in Gehman of:

“a central processing unit (CPU);  
a bus connected to the CPU;  
a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein; and  
a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:  
a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, and  
a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory, wherein the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies.”

The Examiner states:

“As to claim 8, Gehman teaches a server for providing services to a client device, comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);



Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);  
a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55); and  
a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:  
a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 2, lines 11-25), and  
a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory, where the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 2, lines 39-47, (col. 1, lines 13-24))."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As explained, Gehman discloses a section of a client device rather than a server as claimed so the individual components are not connected as claimed and elements are missing as explained above. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element or the element connected as described will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 9, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 9, Gehman teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 further including: a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15)."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 10, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 10, Gehman teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein: the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 15-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 11, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 11, Gehman teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein:

the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 12, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 12, Gehman teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein:

the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 13, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman:

- a central processing unit (CPU);
- a bus connected to the CPU;
- a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein; and
- a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:
  - a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form,
  - a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, wherein: the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies, and the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof; and
- a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 13, Gehman teaches a server for providing services to a client device, comprising:

- a central processing unit (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);
- a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);
- a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55); and
- a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:
  - a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 2, lines 11-25),
  - a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies, and the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col. 1, lines 39-48), and

a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15). 17.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no regular-expression matching circuit or claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 14, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed in Gehman of:

“a client device; and

a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device, the server including:

a central processing unit (CPU),

a bus connected to the CPU,

a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein, and

a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

a FIFO buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, and

a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 14, Gehman teaches a communications network, comprising:

- a client device (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);
- and a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), the server including:
  - a central processing unit (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55),
  - a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55),
  - a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein, and a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), the network interface including:
    - a FIFO buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25), and
    - a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because the relationship between the server and the client device is not mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., sup.*

As to claim 15, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 15, Gehman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 further including:

a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, *supra*.

As to claim 16, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 16, Gehman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 wherein

the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 15-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, *supra*.

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 17, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 17, Gehman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 wherein the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.134(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 18, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 18, Gehman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 wherein the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."



Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 19, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman:

- a client device; and
- a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device, the server including:
  - a central processing unit (CPU),
  - a bus connected to the CPU,
  - a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein, and
  - a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:
    - a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form,
    - a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, wherein:
      - the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies, and
      - the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof, and
    - a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

Serial No.: 10/051,397

Group Art Unit: 2155

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 19, Gehman teaches a communications network comprising:

a client device (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55); and

a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device, the server including:

a central processing unit (CPU), a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55),

a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), and

a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 1, lines 11-25),

a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24), and

the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col. 1, lines 39-48), and

a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15). 23."

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no HTTP cookies regular-expression matching circuit or claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 20, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"receiving the incoming messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer;  
assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer; and  
concurrent with the assembling of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form:  
recognizing Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression pattern matching circuit,  
parsing recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, and  
providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 20, Gehman teaches a method for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:

receiving the incoming messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer; assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25); and  
concurrent with the assembling of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form:

recognizing Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47),

parsing recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), and

providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because the concurrent, recognizing, parsing, or providing steps are not mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 21, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"providing a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 21, Gehman teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 further including:

providing a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no "recognized HTTP message headers" are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., *supra*.

As to claim 22, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server provides the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 22, Gehman teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 wherein:

the providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server provides the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no "parsed HTTP message headers" are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 23, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 23, Gehman teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 further including:

providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra*.

As to claim 24, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

"As to claim 24, Gehman teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 wherein:

the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 24 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.*

As to claim 25, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"receiving the incoming messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer;  
assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer;  
concurrent with the assembling of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form,  
recognizing Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression pattern matching circuit,  
parsing recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, and  
providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server in a compact form;  
providing a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers and  
providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 25, Gehman a [sic] teaches the method for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:

receiving the incoming messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25);

assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25);

concurrent with the assembling of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25),

recognizing Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages received by the FIFO buffer using a

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47),

parsing recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, and providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server in a compact form; providing a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47); and

providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no HTTP message headers are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.*

The other references cited by the Examiner showing the prior art have been considered and are not believed to disclose, teach, or suggest, either singularly or in combination, Applicants' invention as claimed.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.*

#### Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Allowance of claims 1-25 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any surcharge in fees due in connection with the filing of this

Serial No.: 10/051,397  
Group Art Unit: 2155

paper, including any extension of these fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



William D. Zahrt II

Registration No. 26,070

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru  
1110 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd., Suite  
Sunnyvale, CA 94087  
Telephone: (408) 738-0592  
Fax: (408) 738-0881  
June 24, 2005



**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**